



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Bookham Technology plc
% Fry Heath & Spence
The Old College
53 High Street
HORLEY
Surrey, RH6 7BN

The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales
NP10 8QQ

Examiner: 01633 814908
E-mail: geoff.pitchman@patent.gov.uk
Switchboard: 01633 814000
Fax: 01633 814444

Your Reference: P50889UGB
Application No: GB 0019771.5

22 February 2001

Dear Sirs

Patents Act 1977:
Combined Search and Examination Report under Sections 17 and 18(3)

Latest date for reply: 12 August 2002

I enclose two copies of my search and examination report and a copy of the citation.

By the above date you should either file amendments to meet the objections in the report or make observations on them. If you do not, the application may be refused.

Publication

I estimate that, provided you have met all formal requirements, preparations for publication of your application will be completed soon after **2 January 2002**. You will then receive a letter informing you of completion and telling you the publication number and date of publication.

Amendment/withdrawal

If you wish to file amended claims for inclusion with the published application, or to withdraw the application to prevent publication, you must do so before the preparations for publication are completed. **No reminder will be issued.** If you write to the Office less than 3 weeks before the above completion date, please mark your letter prominently: **"URGENT - PUBLICATION IMMINENT"**.



Application No: GB 0019771.5



22 February 2001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Yours faithfully

Geoffrey Pitchman
Examiner

Important information about combined search and examination

I also ask that you take note of the following points. These might have a bearing on the future stages of your application because the examination report has been sent to you before your application has been published.

- (a) You may file voluntary amendments before making a full response to my examination report. We will publish with your application any new or amended claims you file voluntarily or as a full response, provided that they are received before preparations for publication are completed. It would help us when you file amendments before publication if you could **prominently indicate** in a covering letter whether or not the amendments are intended as a full response to the examination report.
- (b) If you file a full response to the examination report before your application is published I will consider it as soon as possible. However, if this would disrupt the publication of your application, I would have to delay taking any action until the application had been published. This delay could be up to 3 months, depending upon when we receive your response.
- (c) There is another situation when there might be a delay between you filing a full response and the Patent Office responding to it. This would arise if you met all my objections but your application had not or had only recently been published. I could not report the outcome of my re-examination until I was satisfied that the search was complete for documents published before the priority date of your invention and that anybody interested in the application has had three months following publication of the application to make observations on the patentability of your invention.
- (d) Provided that the requirements of the Act have been met, I can send your application to grant as early as three months after publication. Before doing so I will bring the original search up to date and raise with you any further objection that might result from this top-up search. However, there is a possibility that at that time I may not have access to all the patent applications published after the priority date of your invention and of possible relevance to your application. If this is the case I would have to complete the search after grant and if necessary raise any new found novelty objection then.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Application No: GB 0019771.5
Claims searched: 1 to 16

Examiner: Geoffrey Pitchman
Date of search: 21 February 2001

Patents Act 1977

Search Report under Section 17

Databases searched:

UK Patent Office collections, including GB, EP, WO & US patent specifications, in:

UK Cl (Ed.S): G2F (FCW)

Int Cl (Ed.7): G02F 1/025 1/225

Other: ONLINE: EPODOC WPI JAPIO INSPEC

Documents considered to be relevant:

Category	Identity of document and relevant passage	Relevant to claims
A	US 5821570 (FRANCE TELECOM)-see abstract and figure 2	1-16

X	Document indicating lack of novelty or inventive step	A	Document indicating technological background and/or state of the art.
Y	Document indicating lack of inventive step if combined with one or more other documents of same category.	P	Document published on or after the declared priority date but before the filing date of this invention.
&	Member of the same patent family	E	Patent document published on or after, but with priority date earlier than, the filing date of this application.



ref: P50889UGB
Application No: GB 0019771.5
Applicant: Bookham Technology plc

Examiner: Geoffrey Pitchman
Tel: 01633 814908
Date of report: 22 February 2001

Latest date for reply: 12 August 2002

Page 1/1

Patents Act 1977

Combined Search and Examination Report under Sections 17 & 18(3)

Plurality of invention

1. Your claims define two separate inventions not forming a single inventive concept. The inventions are:

- a) an electro-optic device having a plurality of spaced doped regions as claimed in claims 1 to 16 and 18 to 20; and
- b) electro-optic device having a curved waveguide but not a plurality of spaced doped regions. as claimed in claim 17.

2. You will need to amend your claims, so that they relate to only one invention or inventive concept. You will also need to make consequential amendments to the description. You may wish to consider filing a divisional application.

Scope of search

3. In accordance with Section 17(6), only the first of these inventions has been searched. The other invention can be searched if you wish. In this case you will have to file a further Form 9/77.

What this report covers

4. I have not been able to consider the novelty or obviousness of the unsearched invention.